

REMARKS - General

By the above amendment, Applicants have amended the title to emphasize the novelty of the invention.

Also applicants have rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

Below is a comment from the inventor on how this invention differs from Crater:


"Crater's invention involves the changing of micro-objects when targeting a device with different functional (control) characteristics with same hardware. Our claim 9 refers to changing the micro-object sets to a different (analogue) set of objects when targeting a different hardware with equal function (control) characteristics. These are two different things."

"The Send/Receive functions are protocol-independent. They are translated into any protocol necessary by the interface between the controller layer and the network layer. This is suggested neither by Crater nor by Stevens."

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over prior art. Therefore the applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey M. Furr, Esq.
Registration No. 38,146

I hereby certify I have transmitted this paper by fax to the Patent and Trademark Office at 703-746-7239 on 2003, September 5.

2003, September 5.


Jeffrey M. Furr, Esq., Reg. No. 38,146

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 05 2003

OFFICIAL